



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,656

03/01/2004

Chirag D. Dalal

VRT0126US

9561

60429 7590 04/22/2008  
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP  
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE  
BLDG. H, SUITE 250  
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER

LI, ZHUO H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2185

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/22/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Young fail to teach or mention storage objects, it is noted that the claimed language fails to specifically define storage objects such that any object being stored in a memory can broadly read as storage object. Note Young clearly teaches a computer system having a first object and a second object (col. 2 lines 3-13), wherein the system stores the properties of an object in a property list (col. 1 lines 46-47). Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the objects as taught by Young to be read as storage objects as stated in claim 8. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, for at least the reasons that Young teaches or mentions storage object and the rejection of claims 8-11 is maintained.

In response to applicant's argument that the proposed modification would change the principle of operation of Russell by requiring Russell's global object specification 160 to comprise Russell's local object specification 150, it appears that Russell implicitly teaches to copy all the object properties from each respective local object definition into a set of respective global object properties in newly defined respective set of global object definitions (col. 14 lines 22-28), thereby the global object specification comprises object properties of the local object specification. Note the claimed language fails to further limiting the component storage object of the second storage object comprises all the property of the first storage object. Furthermore, the claims merely define "the computer system choosing the first storage object to be the component

Art Unit: 2185

storage object due to the property of the first storage object". Since Russell does not specifically teach the second storage object comprising a component storage object and the computer system choosing the first storage object to be the component storage object due to the property of the first storage object, the use of Bulusu is for teaching a method for manipulating a categorized data set (read as second object) based upon an original data set (read as first object) such that the categorized data set comprises category item (read as a component storage object) and a computer system selecting the original data set to be the category item due to the property of the original data set (col. 10 lines 31-67), thereby efficiently manipulating large categorized objects in memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Russell in having the second storage object comprising a component storage object and the computer system choosing the first storage object to be the component storage object due to the property of the first storage object, as per teaching of Bulusu, in order to efficiently manipulate large categorized objects in memory. Thus, the proposed combination of Russell and Bulusu does not require a change in the principle of operation of Russell for at least the reason as stated above since the use of Bulusu is for further teaching the selecting step, which is not explicitly disclosed or taught by Russell. In fact, the proposed combination of Russell and Bulusu teaches the claimed limitations as recited in claims 1, as well as independent claims 12, 19, 20 and 21. Therefore, the teaching of the references is sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. As a result, one skilled in the art would articulate the combination of the references teaching the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1, 12, 19, 20 and 21 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Art Unit: 2185

Claims 6-7 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Russell, Bulusu, and Furuhashi. The rejection on the grounds of claims 6-7 and 17-18 are, respectively, dependent upon one of rejected base claims 1 and 12. Note applicant fails to provide any argument in the Remarks filed 4/7/2008. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

/Sanjiv Shah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2185